

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Yolo)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JEREMY RYAN DAVID,

Defendant and Appellant.

C073381

(Super. Ct. No. CRF13186)

Appointed counsel for defendant Jeremy Ryan David asked this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*).) After reviewing the entire record, we conclude there was no error and affirm the judgment.

**I**

On January 10, 2013, a “loss prevention” officer at the Food 4 Less store in Woodland, California, saw defendant take two packages of batteries and a bottle of lotion and leave the store without paying for any of the items. The loss prevention officer contacted the Woodland Police Department. A police officer arrived shortly thereafter and arrested defendant.

Defendant was charged with petty theft with a prior conviction (Pen. Code, §§ 484, subd. (a), 490.5, subd. (a), and 666). The People further alleged defendant previously served two prison terms, as described in Penal Code section 667.5,

subdivision (b). Defendant pled no contest to petty theft and admitted serving a prior prison term. In exchange for his plea, the People dismissed the remaining allegations, and agreed to an aggregate term of three years to be served in county jail.

The trial court sentenced defendant in accordance with his plea. The court also awarded defendant 96 days of custody credit (48 actual and 48 conduct) and ordered him to pay various fines and fees. Defendant appeals; he obtained a certificate of probable cause.

## II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asked this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed and we have received no communication from defendant.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
HOCH, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAURO, Acting P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MURRAY, J.